

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Request for Interview

Applicant requests an interview to discuss the merits of the rejection. The undersigned will contact the examiner shortly.

Art Rejection

Claims 1-30 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hutchings (USP 5,940,813) in view of Roddy (USP 6,678,880). Applicant notes that the introductory sentence of Detailed Paragraph 5 inadvertently refers Judge instead of Roddy. Applicant traverses this rejection because neither Hutchings nor Roddy would have taught processing only the records to which the identifiers are assigned.

In rejecting the claims, the examiner urges that Hutchings discloses executing processing according to the processing order, relying on the passage set forth in column 9, lines 10-29, but does not particularly disclose how the priority codes are changed. The examiner thus relies on Roddy for the proposition that displaying a list of objects and changing the priorities of the displayed list of objects would have been obvious.

Applicants disagree with the examiner's assessment of the applied references. Hutchings discloses a transaction mover 32 that reads mover queue records (containing information for determining the order in which the temporary queue files will be processed) and sorts the same based on the read information. Once the priority has been sorted, any change made to the codes does not become effective until after the mover is started the next time. Since all the items in the temporary queue are processed, even if Hutchings were to list records and assign priority codes to the listed records, Hutchings still would not have disclosed **processing only the records to which the identifiers are assigned.**

Roddy also would not have taught processing only those records from the list that have been assigned with priority codes. Accordingly, applicant submits that claims 1-30 distinguish over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

14 OCTOBER 2006

DATE

/Lyle Kimms/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. No. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)